

### REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 8, and 17 are amended to clarify the preambles.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1-23, because claims 1, 8, and 17 are amended to remove any reference to performing in-line expansion. As a result, claims 2-7, which depend from claim 1, claims 9-16, which depend from claim 8, and claims 18-23, which depend from claim 17 are also definite.

The Office Action rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,818,447 to Wolf et al. ("Wolf").

Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 24, because Wolf does not teach each and every element of claim 24. Wolf is directed to a system and method for in-place editing and viewing of an electronic mail message using a separate program. (Wolf, col. 14, lines 48-50). Figure 11 is a diagram illustrating the Messaging Application Programming Interface (MAPI) format for storing email message data. (Wolf, col. 3, lines 59-60, col. 4, lines 28-29). Claim 24 recites, *inter alia*, "a record body display flag, wherein status of said record body display flag controls display of said record body data, said status of said record body display flag being responsive to selection of said record header data." Wolf fails to disclose any such record body display flag. In figure 11 of Wolf, there is a "mail message 1100" that includes "a body portion 1105", but figure 11 fails to disclose any record body display flag that controls the display of the record body data. (Wolf, figure 11, col. 16, line 38 to col. 17, line 47).

The Office Action stated claims 1-23 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Also, the Office Action stated that the reason for allowable subject matter was that the prior art of record failed to show a mechanism for setting a record body display flag on or off.

Applicant believes claims 1-23 are allowable without amendment for the reasons given above with respect to overcoming the § 112 rejections. In addition to the Examiner's reasons for allowance, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable for many reasons, including any in the specification and the entire prosecution history.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and that a Notice of Allowance be issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 09-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

WALTER A. MANRIQUE

CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
Applicant's Attorneys

By: *Lee A. Nicholson*  
Lee A. Nicholson  
Registration No. 48,346

Date: June 7, 2004  
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone: (860) 286-2929  
Customer No.: 23413